



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,365	11/20/2003	Toyokazu Sugimoto	83394.0020	3596
26/021 7590 02/20/2008 HOGAN & HARTSON LLP. 1999 AVENUE OF THE STARS SUITE 1400 LOS ANGELES, CA 90067				
EXAMINER				
VETTER, DANIEL				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,365

Applicant(s)

SUGIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

DANIEL P. VETTER

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4 and 7-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4 and 7-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Claims

1. Claims 1-13 were previously pending in this application. Claims 3-4 and 7-9 were amended, and claims 1-2, 5-6, and 11-13 were canceled in the reply filed December 4, 2007. Claims 3-4 and 7-10 are currently pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's amendment to claim 3 overcomes the objection to claims 3-4 and 8, and it is withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 3 under § 112, second paragraph, have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection is withdrawn.
4. Applicant's amendments overcome the rejection of claims 4 and 7-10 under § 112, second paragraph, and it is withdrawn.
5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 3 under § 102(b) have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 10 under § 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that DeLorme does not teach a display of a present location on the displayed reservation map;

however DeLorme teaches that the route disclosed in the originally cited passage can also display "present actual location" as a start location using GPS means (col. 29, line 27). Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3-4 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,502,806 (Reference A of the PTO-892 part of paper no. 20070523) in view of Laval, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,173,209 (Reference D of the PTO-892 part of paper no. 20070523).

9. As per claim 3, Mahoney teaches a facility reserving system comprising an authenticating means (column 4, line 5) for receiving a human-perceptible unique, second identifier displayed on the sold admission ticket (column 3, line 23) via the communications network and thereby authenticating validity thereof (column 4, line 11) and; a reservation information registering means (column 6, line 44) for carrying out communications with said user terminal upon obtaining the authentication (column 6, line 41) and registering, with a facility reservation data base DB, said first identifier (column 6, lines 49-51) and information for reserving facility names and reservation time slots as facility reservation information thereof produced by a user operating said user terminal in an associated manner (column 4, lines 12-15), wherein the site encloses the one or more facilities (column 2, lines 27-28). Mahoney does not explicitly teach the user terminal is provided outside the site; which is taught by Laval (column 8, lines 54-60). It would have been prima facie obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings of Laval into the system taught by Mahoney to permit customers to plan their day ahead of time (as taught by Laval; column 8, lines 60-61).

10. As per claim 4, Mahoney in view of Laval teaches the system of claim 3 as described above. Mahoney further teaches at the time of admission into said site or facility, the unique, first identifier of the information storage element mounted in said

admission ticket is readout (column 4, lines 33-36), and admission is permitted while referring to said facility reservation information registered with said facility reservation DB with this identifier as a key (column 4, line 37).

11. As per claim 8, Mahoney in view of Laval teaches the system of claim 3 as described above. Mahoney further teaches a reservation screen information producing/outputting means (column 4, line 15) for, by referring to said facility reservation DB, producing screen information in a form where information for reservation-available facility names and time slots thereof can be selected by the user (column 4, lines 13-15) and providing the same to said user terminal or on-site-installed reservation terminal (column 4, line 15).

12. As per claim 9, Mahoney in view of Laval teaches the systems of claims 3 and 4 as described above. Mahoney further teaches a reservation screen information receiving means (column 4, line 15) for carrying out communications with said facility reserving system upon approximation or loading of information storage element having said computer-identifiable unique, first identifier, mounted in said admission ticket (column 4, lines 4-7; column 6, lines 41-47) and receiving, from said facility reserving system, reservation screen information in a form where information for reservation-available facility names and time slots thereof can be selected (column 4, line 12); and a selection input information communicating means for taking in a selection input for a

facility reservation by the user while displaying said reservation screen information (column 4, lines 13-15) and sending the same to said facility reserving system via said communications network (column 4, line 15).

13. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney, et al. in view of Laval, et al., as applied to claim 3 above, in further view of Redmann, et al., U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0174003 (Reference B of the PTO-892 part of paper no. 20070523).

14. As per claim 7, Mahoney in view of Laval teaches the system of claim 3 as described above. Mahoney further teaches a group (column 1, line 35) reservation receiving means (column 4, line 5) for receiving human-perceptible unique, second identifiers respectively displayed on said admission tickets (column 3, line 23) for a predetermined number of persons (column 4, lines 52-55). Mahoney in view of Laval does not teach via said admission ticket possessed by a representative and permitting a reservation input thereof only for an identical time slot of an identical facility; which is taught by Redmann (¶¶ 0143-47). It would have been prima facie obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings of Redmann into the system taught by Mahoney in view of Laval in order to allow for a

preferred party to use a no-wait entrance to an attraction (as taught by Redmann; ¶ 0143).

15. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mahoney, et al. in view of Laval, et al., as applied to claim 9 above, in further view of DeLorme, et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,948,040 (Reference C of the PTO-892 part of paper no. 20070523).

16. As per claim 10, Mahoney in view of Laval teaches the system of claim 9 as described above. Mahoney in view of Laval does not explicitly teach a display control means for displaying, in addition to a present location, an arrangement of facilities installed at the periphery in a map form and also displaying already-reserved facilities in a manner differentiated from other facilities. DeLorme teaches a display control means (column 14, line 60) for displaying, in addition to a present location, an arrangement of facilities installed at the periphery in a map form (column 22, lines 49-51; column 29, line 27) and also displaying already-reserved facilities in a manner differentiated from other facilities (column 22, lines 46, 55-56). It would have been prima facie obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings of DeLorme into the system taught by Mahoney in view of Laval to enable the

user to visually identify selected geographical information (as taught by DeLorme; column 22, lines 56-58).

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **DANIEL P. VETTER** whose telephone number is

(571)270-1366. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8am to 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628